

REMARKS**Claim Amendment**

Claim 32 has been amended to recite that the polyurea is formed solvent-free from isocyanate prepolymer and amine resin, *i.e.* in a dry reaction. Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification as filed, for example on page 5, lines 3-5, in FIG. 6 and the corresponding description on page 5, lines 9-15, on page 8, lines 22-25 and in the original Claims 15 and 18 as filed. Claim 32 has further been amended to provide antecedent basis for Claims 33 and 34.

Claim 33 has been amended to correct a typographical error and to provide the antecedent basis for Claim 34.

Claim 34 has been amended to correspond to the amendments to Claims 32 and 33.

New Claim 72 has been added. New Claim 72 is directed to the subject matter of Claim 32 as well as to the subject matter of the original Claims 15 and 18 as filed.

This amendment introduces no new matter.

Rejection of Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Pat. No. 3,499,872

The Examiner rejected Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Pat. No. 3,499,872 to Thoma *et al.* (Hereinafter, the “’872 Patent”). With reference to column 10, lines 38-39 and to column 18, lines 15-18, the Examiner stated that the ‘872 Patent inherently discloses all the claimed steps.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s interpretation of the ‘872 Patent. However, in the interest of facilitating prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 32. Applicant submit that Claim 32 as amended is not anticipated by the ‘972 Patent.

The ‘872 Patent describes the formation of polyureas in polar organic solvents by reacting diisocyanate with a solution of a reaction product of diamine with either CO₂ or SO₂. See column 2, lines 50-56. The ‘872 Patent also discloses that the direct reaction of isocyanates and amines in solvents results in products that cannot be shaped to form foils (*i.e.* sheets), due to undesirable cross-linked polyaddition reactions. See column 2, lines 4-12.

Thus, the '872 Patent (i) does *not* teach formation of polyurea sheets by direct mixing (dry reaction, in the absence of solvents) of isocyanate prepolymer and amine resin; and (ii) teaches a different process.

Accordingly, the '872 Patent does not disclose all steps of Claim 32 as amended and does not anticipate Claim 32.

For the same reason, new Claim 72 is novel over the '872 Patent.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 33 as being obvious over the '872 Patent and Claim 34 as being obvious over the '872 Patent in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,194,113 to Lasch *et al.*

Without recapitulating the Examiner's arguments, Applicants note that where the claimed invention is rejected as *prima facie* obvious in view of a combination of references, M.P.E.P. §2142 requires that "[...] the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Because Claims 33 and 34 incorporate all elements of their base Claim 32, and because the prior art references cited by the Examiner do not teach all steps of the method claimed by the base Claim 32, Claims 33 and 34 cannot be found obvious in view of the art of record.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Alexander Akhiezer
Alexander Akhiezer
Registration No. 54,617
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 11/9/08